

### REMARKS

Claims 1 - 16 remain in this application. Claims 1, 5, and 6 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments noted is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 4 - 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, it was found that it is unclear what the "compliance device" is. Applicant submits that the "compliance device" found in claims 4 - 7 is enabled by the specification. A "compliance device" 50 is described on page 7, lines 4 - 14 of the specification. A "compliance device" has an adjustable tonnage setting and is used to mechanically adjust the tonnage, i.e., force used to hem or stamp a workpiece. In other words, a "compliance device" regulates the force applied to a workpiece by the punch and anvil to comply with the force required to properly hem or stamp the workpiece. Applicant submits that based upon the disclosure, one skilled in the art would understand what is meant by a "compliance device." Further, applicant submits that a "compliance device" is a term of art understood by those of ordinary skill in the art. For these reasons, applicant requests that the Section 112, first paragraph rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the limitation "the platen connection feature" in claim 5 and the limitation "the drive support connection feature" in claim 6 were found to have insufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 5 has been amended to read --a platen connection feature of the platen-- instead of "the platen connection feature." Support for a platen connection feature is found on page 6, lines 13 - 15. Claim 6 has been amended to read --a drive support connection feature of the drive support-- instead of "the drive support connection feature." Support for a drive support connection feature is found on page 6, lines 1 - 5. Applicant submits

that the claims are definite and comply with Section 112, second paragraph, and therefore requests that the Section 112, second paragraph rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to the amendments to the claims, claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation that the drive support is fixed. Further, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that actuation of the drive mechanism moves the link bars and the attached vertical platen in a horizontal direction along the linear guidance system relative to the drive support. Support for these amendments can be found in the drawings as well as the specification on page 5, lines 19 – 20 and page 8, lines 14 – 28.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meyerle (U.S. Patent No. 5,086,633). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Meyerle fails to disclose the step of coupling crank arms of a drive mechanism to a platen via link bars, as claim 16 requires. Meyerle discloses push rods 44, 54 generally connected between thrust motors 40, 50 and motion members 10, 12. The thrust motors, however, do not include crank arms, nor are there crank arms coupled to the motion members via the push rods. Therefore, claim 16 is not anticipated by Meyerle.

For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102(b) rejection of claim 16 as anticipated by Meyerle be withdrawn.

Claims 1 – 8 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerle in view of Saint Denis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,612,146, hereinafter “Saint Denis”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding claim 1, Meyerle does not teach or suggest bushings set in a punch die set, as claim 1 requires. In Meyerle, the bushings 14 are set in the motion members/platen 10, 12 rather than in the die 30, 32. Further, Meyerle does not teach or suggest guide shafts secured to the anvil die set on one end and engaged to one of the bushings of the punch die set on the other end, as claim 1 requires. In Meyerle, the guide shafts are instead secured to motion members 10, 12. Furthermore, Meyerle does not teach or suggest a fixed drive support or that the drive mechanism moves the link bars and attached vertical platen in a horizontal direction along the linear guidance system relative to the

drive support. In Meyerle, both motion member 10 and motion member 12 move relative to each other, and the motion members 10, 12 move along the guide pins 16 (i.e., the guide pins are stationary).

Moreover, Saint Denis does not teach or suggest a roller device horizontally mounted on top of a horizontal base support for horizontal movement of a vertical platen holding a die set to perform a pressing operation such as hemming or stamping, as in the present invention. The conveyor system of Saint Denis is only for changing die. There is no teaching or suggestion in Saint Denis that the conveyor is used to perform a press motion. Hence, there is no motivation to combine the conveyor of Saint Denis with the punch press of Meyerle. Therefore, no combination of Meyerle with Saint Denis results in the present invention as claimed in claim 1, and claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 – 8, depending directly or indirectly from claim 1, are therefore also allowable.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 4, Meyerle does not teach or suggest the apparatus further comprising at least one compliance device. Items 65 and 66 in Meyerle are probe pins, not compliance devices. The probe pins 65, 66 are described in Meyerle on col. 5, line 41 through col. 6, line 30. The compliance device of the present invention, as described above, has an adjustable tonnage setting and is used to adjust the amount of force applied in hemming or stamping a workpiece. In contrast, the probe pins 65, 66 detect the presence of an opposing surface. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable over Meyerle, and any combination of Meyerle with Saint Denis.

Regarding claim 5, item 78 in Meyerle is not a compliance device, nor is it a compliance device located on a platen connection feature. Instead, item 78 is a return spring that returns the platen/motion member 10 back to its initial position. Return spring 78 is described on col. 7, lines 24 – 42. Therefore, claim 5 is allowable over Meyerle, and any combination of Meyerle with Saint Denis.

Regarding claim 6, Meyerle does not teach or suggest a compliance device located on a drive support connection feature. As noted above, the probe pins 65, 66 discussed on

col. 5, lines 41 – 45 are not compliance devices. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable over Meyerle, and any combination of Meyerle with Saint Denis.

Regarding claim 7, item 41 in Meyerle is not a compliance device, nor is it a compliance device located on link bar attachments. Item 41 instead is a ferromagnetic armature that is part of an electromagnetic thrust motor 40 used to provide a punch/drive force. The armature 41 is discussed on col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 2. Therefore, claim 7 is allowable over Meyerle, and any combination of Meyerle with Saint Denis.

For all of these reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 1 – 8 based upon Meyerle in view of Saint Denis be withdrawn.

A petition for a one month extension of time and a PTO-2038 authorizing payment of \$120.00 for the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a)(1) are included herewith.

This amendment and request for reconsideration is felt to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

James B. Toeniskoetter et al.

Fildes & Outland, P.C.



Christopher J. Fildes, Attorney  
Registration No. 32,132  
20916 Mack Avenue, Suite 2  
Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236  
(313) 885-1500